DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 321 367 EA 021 989

AUTHOR Lebda, James J.
TITLE Superintendents' Involvement in Principal Pay Design: An Exploratory Study.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Conflict Resolution; *Decision Making; Elementary Secondary Education; *Principals; *Salaries; *Superintendents; *Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Despite a growing body of literature on the school superintendency, little is known about the role, influence, and satisfaction of district superintendents when school boards make compensation decisions for principals. This exploratory study, which reported findings from a sample of 215 Pennsylvania superintendents, attempted to identify and investigate superintendent involvement in principal salary decisions conducted under a state-mandated meet and discuss model. The study's conceptual and empirical framework was based on three bodies of literature (the superintendency, administrative compensation, and conflict management). Data were reported by 177 superintendents, for an 82.3 percent return rate. Collected data recorded superintendents' perceptions using a survey instrument requesting demographic, procedural, and attitudinal information. Results suggested that superintendents are engaged in principal pay discussions. An active role in dialogue, accompanied by influence and support for principals, was associated with the highest levels of superintendent loyalty and satisfaction, as well as more positive views of managerial interaction. Conflict between superintendents and principals appeared minimal. Conversely, superintendent participation without influence during principal pay design constrains the process by limiting the exchange of ideas that help develop realistic compensation packages and professional growth opportunities for principals. (50 references) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED321367

SUPERINTENDENTS' INVOLVEMENT IN PRINCIPAL PAY DESIGN:

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Dr. James J. Lebda, Principal

Bellefonte Area High School

Bellefonte, Pennsylvania

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the

American Educational Research Association

Boston, MA.

April 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James J. Lebda

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 989

BEST COPY AVAILABL.

ABSTRACT

Despite a growing body of literature on the school superintendency, little is known about the role, influence, and satisfaction of district superintendents when school boards make compensation decisions for principals. This study which reported findings from a sample of 215 superintendents, was exploratory in nature. Its purpose was to identify and investigate superintendent involvement in principal pay decisions conducted under a state-mandated meet and discuss model. Data suggested that superintendents are engaged in principal pay discussions, and an active role in dialogue accompanied by influence and support for principals was associated with the highest levels of superintendent loyalty and satisfaction as well as more positive views of managerial interaction. Conflict between superintendents and principals appeared minimal.

SUPERINTENDENTS' INVOLVEMENT IN PRINCIPAL PAY DESIGN: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The organizational context of the school superintendency remains a vital topic for unremitting inquiry and debate. As chief school administrators, superintendents in the more than 14,000 public schools across the nation oversee expenditures in excess of 140 billion dollars, supervise nearly 4 million employees, and provide direction for educational programs affecting 40 million students. The conjunctive roles of educational leader and human or financial resource manager accentuate the importance and difficulty of the job (Educational Research Service, 1985).

Yet, upon reviewing the extant literature, one is struck by the lack of circumspect and penetrating analysis. March (1978), Bridges (1982), and Crowson (1987) attempted explanations or identified existing gaps that, as Crowson and Morris (1987) further observed, included interactions among superintendents, school boards, and the educational bureaucracy. Principals, who function as middle level managers, occupy a central position in the bureaucracy and presumably interact on a frequent basis with their superintendents.

A recurrent opportunity for superintendent/principal interaction occurs in principal pay design. Often, school boards annually review principal emolument as part of a

larger compensation process for all school administrators. The superintendent's role, influence, and satisfaction with this process are neglected aspects of the research. Superintendent participation in principal pay design is an important dimension of managerial interaction. As Rebore (1985) concluded, this particular role may well furnish "the most difficult task for a superintendent of schools" (p. 44).

In the present study, superintendents' involvement in principal pay design was examined through the framework of a state-mandated meet and discuss model for administrator compensation. It attempted to answer some basic, exploratory questions:

1. What roles do superintendents play in principal pay design?
2. Do superintendent roles, perceived levels of influence, and expressed satisfaction with the process relate to superintendent attitudes toward school boards and management teams?
3. Has the imposition of a state-mandated model altered traditional views of superintendent influence and satisfaction with the compensation development process for principals?

CONCEPTUAL AND EMPIRICAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual and empirical framework for this study takes root in three bodies of literature: (1) superintendency; (2) administrative compensation; (3) conflict management.

SUPERINTENDENT STUDIES

School superintendents have been described vicariously as jugglers (Cuban, 1984), gardeners (Burlingame, 1981), and orchestra leaders (Blumberg & Blumberg, 1985). While each metaphor targets a perception of superintendent work, the literature reveals little about the nature of managerial interaction. To some the superintendency remains an enigma. But one key to unravelling the puzzle, according to Crowson (1987), necessitates research examining the:

> ...betwixt-and between position of the superintendent politically at the point of contact between board and bureaucracy...(p.65).

Principal pay design is a meaningful "point of contact" between superintendents, principals, and school boards. Unfortunately, most descriptive studies of the superintendency largely ignore this dimension. Instead, they focus on job preoccupations (Knezevich, 1971), attitudes toward contemporary issues (Keough & Seaton, 1988), and expressions of self-confidence or competence (Cunningham & Hentges, 1982). Normative views of superintendent work, on the other hand, are more revealing. Willower & Fraser (1979-80), Duignan (1980), and Pitner and Ogawa (1981) described superintendents as nostalgic leaders with overcrowded work agendas dominated by disjointed, brief, and diverse verbal interaction with subordinates.

The larger issues of influence and conflict furnish a more refined basis for comprehending the dynamics of princi-

pal, superintendent, and board interaction. What impact do superintendents exert over the school organization? Two recent studies, Hart and Ogawa (1987) and Peterson, Murphy, and Hallinger (1987), suggested that superintendents influence student achievement or the technical core of curriculum and instruction. De Young (1986), Crowson and Morris (1987), and Paulu (1989) reported evidence of superintendent influence in the policy and implementation arena when education reforms were imposed externally. Others noted marginal superintendent impact on school productivity and managerial activity (Hannaway & Sproul, 1978-79; Cuban, 1984). But it is commonly recognized that interaction and influence generate opportunities for conflict. The superintendency has been described as a conflict-laden occupation (Arnez, 1981; Blumberg, 1985) while others debated the presence of conflict and its impact on school organizations (McCarty & Ramsey, 1971; Zeigler & Jennings, 1974; Boyd, 1976; & Cuban, 1985).

Despite continued debate, superintendents perform multi-dimensional roles marked by differing expectations associated with organizational task accomplishment. They interpret and implement board policy, address taxpayer concerns, and exercise control over subordinates. Quite often superintendents engineer a compensation system affecting administrative, service, and instructional per-

sonnel. And, as Castetter (1986) observed, an effective compensation system exerts important influence over goal accomplishment and employee satisfaction. This task contains the ingedients for considerable influence and high conflict. Yet the literature is virtually silent on what constitutes a proper superintendent role in administrative compensation development.

ADMINISTRATIVE COMPENSATION

Compensation development is a significant organizational task with pervasive consequences for schools and their administrators (Castetter, 1986; Lebda, 1988). From the organizational perspective, the compensation system determines allocation of scarse resources in a highly visible manner. Decisions about wages, salaries, and fringe benefits represent rewards and influence the school's ability to attract, retain, and motivate talented administrators. Executive compensation, which is a label aptly applied to educational managers, is particularly important because school results more often reflect the contributions of this group juxtaposed to lower positions in the school hierarchy (Castetter, 1986). On an individual level, wage and benefit determinations provide administrators with a source of internal power, constitute the peak of a reward structure, and may satisfy basic professional needs including creativity and self-actualization (Castetter, 1986; Lebda, 1987).

In reviewing the literature on administrator compensa-

tion, two themes predominated. First, several writers identified a common set of factors that were used frequently as a basis for determing wages and benefits. Second, a growing recognition has emgered with regard to the importance of process and participation in compensation development. And, both themes have implications for the involvement of school superintendents.

The first line of inquiry examined through comparative studies the mechanical operations and criteria used in decision making. Several questions emerged. What are the major components used to construct salary schedules? Do certain traditional factors explain salary differentials? Will the incorporation of additional criteria result in greater equity? Typically, an administrative salary schedule contains four major components including a salary base, specific structure, an incremental pattern, and a comonent for advancement (Educational Research Service, 1987). But frequently an administrator's length of service in a district and level of education exert the greatest influence over salary determinations. Complimenting this list of traditional factors are the administrator's previous salary, cost of living, teacher salaries, and the availability of resources (Caldwell, 1986). Others have suggested that added criteria such as gender influence (Pounder, 1985; Tracy & Sheehan, 1987) or performance appraisal through evaluation (Bolton, 1980) may offset problems of inequity.

In such discussions, the role and influence of a school superintendent are limited. Mechanistic approaches to salary determination allow little room for meaningful dialogue and creative ideas. Performance appraisal may present more lattitude but within the confines of traditional criteria that could be fraught with inequity. Greater opportunity exists for the superintendent when discussions of criteria and review of the administrative compensation process occurs. In short, boards of education who allow superintendents an active role in discussions pertaining to administrator salary reap the greatest benefits when the overall process and individual administrator performance are key agenda issues.

Process and participation represent the second--and perhaps more meaningful--theme in the literature on administrator compensation. Traditional approaches to principal pay design have relied upon unilateral board decision making. Under such conditions, superintendents functioned as broker or spokesperson for principals in advance of final board decisions. Therefore, the superintendent's role and influence were functions of the larger relationship between boards and superintendents relative to school governance.

With the advent of administrator bargaining that reached 1 in 14 school districts at the beginning of this decade (Cooper & Murrmann, 1982; Cooper, 1979), formalized relationships between principals and school boards altered the traditional role played by superintendents. In many

instances, superintendents aligned with board positions and were no longer called upon to broker the interests of principals. Some writers who examined collective bargaining generally attributed strained, bureaucratic, and adversarial relationships to this process (Karlitz, 1978; Salmon, 1972). Others like Burton (1977), Caldwell and Paul (1984) and Lebda (1988) uncovered evidence of positive superintendent-principal relationships as the level of formal board-principal interaction increased.

Changes in the process for determining administrator salaries have undoubtedly influenced the traditional role played by superintendents. As direct administrator participation increases, it remains unclear as to the nature and extent of the role change along with the effects of this new labor environment on the superintendent's influence and satisfaction. Recent data suggest that superintendents continue to participate in decisions affecting principal pay (Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelly, & McCleary, 1988; Caldwell, 1988). How do superintendents view their role, influence, and level of satisfaction? And, have these new relationships resulted in a higher level of conflict accompanied by more negative managerial interactions?

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

Interaction among superintendents, principals, and school boards on matters of administrator compensation present innumerable opportunites for conflict. Thus, conflict and its proper management are essential elements in

any discussion of the superintendent's role, influence, and satisfaction with this process.

What is conflict? Is it desirable within an administrative team? Are there behaviors that channel conflict into a positive direction?

Definitions of conflict in the literature are numerous but that offered by Deutsch (1973) is perhaps the most relevant to any discussion of administrator compensation. He noted that conflict arises when the behavior of one party interferes or otherwise prevents the desired action of another. And, as Gross, Mason, & McEachern (1958) noted, personnel decisions frequently result in role conflict for the superintendent. In the case of administrator compensation, incompatibility among the values and expectations of superintendents, principals, and board members may increase the level of conflict, create disaffection, and contribute to a long term, acrimonious relationship with each party.

Superintendent values are particularly important to the process. According to Williams (1979), values provide a set of criteria by which choice, preference, or judgments are made. They also represent the ideal versus the actual in a given circumstance (Schein, 1985). In administrative work, values influence decision making especially under conditions that require the balancing of competing claims. Values are also an integral part of the school culture (Kasten & Ashbaugh, 1987). Thus, the involvement of school

superintendents in administrative compensation development may place their values and expectations in conflict with the board, principals, or both groups.

Although conflict has been often associated with negative outcomes, it may be desirable when properly managed (Tubbs, 1978). Competition, domination, and provocation are three by-products of conflict. Behaviors supported by positive attitudes and desire for accomodation can result in renewed interest and enthusiasm, creative ideas, higher morale, and increased performance. Principal pay discussions that are frank, conducted in good faith, and directed toward a better understanding of administrator roles and performance will bolster the administrative team. In that regard, dominating or provocative behavior by the superintendent will undermine the benefit of direct interaction and trigger negative consequences.

It is important, therefore, that the proper management of conflict occur during principal pay design. Toward that end, superintendents, principals, and board members need to engage in behaviors that resolve conflict and channel it into a positive direction. In the present study, superintendent perceptions of principal behavior during pay discussions were examined. The framework for conflict resolution was adpated from Tubbs (1978) who summarized the key behaviors including: (1) a focus on the issue and not personality; (2) building upon areas of agreement; (3)

striving for consensus; (4) avoiding provocation; (5) minimizing overreaction to other's comments; (6) compromising.

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This study was exploratory in nature. Its purpose was to identify and investigate several dimensions of superintendent participation in principal pay design conducted within the framework of a state-mandated meet and discuss model for determining middle manager compensation.

Public school districts within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania were the focus of the investigation. A purposive sample of 215 superintendents was constructed based on previous principal pay design research reported by Caldwell and Paul (1984), Caldwell (1988), and Lebda (1988). District size, wealth, and geographic location were considered in the selection of representative schools. Data were reported by 177 superintendents constituting a high rate of return (82.3%) for the study. Collected data recorded the perceptions of superintendents following several years of implementation for the state-mandated meet and discuss model.

Each respondent received a Project Survey Instrument that collected demographic, procedural, and attitudinal data. Demographics included superintendent age, gender, years in administration, years in current position, district enrollment and wealth, as well as the number of principals employed in the school organization. Procedural data

related to the actual meet and discuss process, board posture during compensation development, the superintendent's role and influence, along with superintendent support for principals. Attitudinal variables were measured by a Likert-type scale and included role satisfaction, board loyalty, satisfaction with the process, management team relations, conflict generated by the process, conflict resolution behavior, and superintendent/principal interaction.

An instrument reliability coefficient of Alpha was calculated at .893. Alpha measures for the individual subsets included: (1) board loyalty (.851); (2) management team relations (.60); (3) conflict generated by the process (.739); (4) conflict resolution behavior (.702); (5) superintendent/principal interaction (.702). One-way analysis of variance with Tukey follow-up was used to analyze relationships between procedural and attitudinal variables. Additionally, correlations among demographic, procedural, and attitudinal variables were calculated. The .05 level of confidence provided the test for statistical significance.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Superintendents in this study actively engaged in meet and discuss sessions resulting in compensation packages for school principals. Although roles varied among districts, respondents expressed role and procedural satisfaction, reported high to moderate levels of influence over decisions, and indicated a predilection to support principal claims.

Conflict generated by the process appeared minimal.

RESPONDENT PROFILE

The typical superintendent was a male whose age ranged between 46-55 years with 11 to 20 years of experience in school administration and 1 to 6 years of tenure in the current position. This superintendent supervised between 3-6 building principals in districts with enrollments ranging from 1300 to more than 5500 students.

A variety of approaches to principal pay design were reported by superintendents. Formal sessions with the board (36%), informal board sessions (43%), sessions with the superintendent only (20%), and no input (1%) were the primary options available to principals when meet and discuss activities occurred. During plan development, more than 6 out of every 10 superintendents felt that the board's posture supported a management team philosophy while 1 out of 3 respondents perceived mere compliance with the law.

Superintendents who responded to the survey identified several roles in the process including board spokesperson (20%), active in board discussions (55%), observer at board sessions (16%), and not present at board sessions (9%). However, an overwhelming majority of respondents noted substantial influence during the interactional process: high influence (48%), moderate influence (44%), little or no influence (8%). This finding is particularly interesting when one considers that 7 out of every 10 superintendents viewed their level of influence as unchanged in meet and

discuss compared with previous methods of principal pay design. Additionally, the respondents reported support for principal claims: high support (72%), moderate support (24%), neutral posture (4%). None of the respondents indicated opposition to the wage and salary positions staked out by middle managers.

As noted in Table 1, several significant correlations existed among demographic, procedural, and attitudinal variables. It would appear that longer tenure in the super-

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

intendeny was associated with more positive management team and principal relationships. Higher levels of superintendent satisfaction, more positive working relationships, and lower levels of perceived conflict related to formal, principal/board interaction. Too, a board posture supporting management team philosophy linked with high role satisfaction and a positive working climate among top and middle management.

Numerous relationships existed among the subset of attitudinal variables and the superintendent's role, influence, and satisfaction. Negative correlations resulted from the employed coding scheme. However, the data suggest that an active superintendent role accompanied by high influence and strong support for the principal's position correlated with high levels of superintendent loyalty,

satisfaction, and more positive views of management team interaction. And, as Table 1 further indicated, inter-correlations among attitudinal variables disclosed strong positive relationships.

PARTICIPATION AND SATISFACTION

As noted earlier, a majority of superintendents in this study indicated that principal pay decisions resulted through dialogue involving superintendents, principals, and board members.

Three variations for dialogue were identified: (1) formal meet and discuss; (2) informal principal-board discussions; (3) superintendent-principal sessions only. In addition, school board posture regardless of procedural variation ranged from support for management team philosophy through mere compliance with the legislation to a denial of meaningful opportunities for dialogue.

Clearly, superintendents in this study expressed the highest levels of board loyalty (F-ratio=5.4937; p=.0013), role satisfaction (F-ratio=6.4626; p=.0004), positive attitudes toward management team relations (F-ratio=3.0448; p=.0304), procedural conflict (F-ratio=3.0805; p=.0291), or superintendent/principal interaction (F-ratio=4.1523; p=.0073) when principals dealt only with superintendents as pay decisions were made. Likewise, more positive superintendent attitudes emerged when the board posture was viewed as supporting management team philosophy.

How do identified superintendent roles relate to their

expressed levels of satisfaction, board loyalty, or perceptions of managerial interaction?

Over 8 out of 10 superintendents expressed some form of satisfaction with their specific role while approximately 2 out of 10 superintendents were uncertain or dissatisfied. This finding parallels superintendent views regarding the overall meet and discuss process. In contrast, a nearly even split occurred when superintendents were asked to identify their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with principal pay design procedures prior to meet and discuss.

Table 2 reveals various relationships among procedural or attitudinal variables and superintendent role. It would appear that the role played by superintendents in principal pay design related significantly to their assesment of

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

influence, support for principals, loyalty to the board, and managerial interaction except for principal/superintendent interaction. Tukey follow-up revealed no significant differences between the roles of board spokesperson or active in discussions. However, in all cases, significant differences existed between the roles of board spokesperson or active in discusssions and observer or non-participant. In short, these data suggest that meaningful opportunities for active superintendent involvement in principal pay

discussions are related to higher levels of superintendent satisfaction and more positive views of managerial interaction. Furthermore, there appears to be no advantage in allowing the superintendent to participate only as an observer.

INFLUENCE AND SUPPORT FOR PRINCIPALS

Superintendent participation without influence during principal pay design constrains the process by limiting the exchange of ideas or viewpoints that contribute toward development of realistic compensation packages and professional growth opportunties for principals.

In the present study, superintendents regardless of their role indicated high to moderate levels of influence in patterns that remained similar to conditions predating the use of meet and discuss. Summary data in Table 3 underscored the importance of perceived influence in relation to expressed satisfaction and superintendent views of managerial working relationships. High or moderate levels of

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

influence were significantly related to the strongest expressions of board loyalty, role and procedural satisfaction, diminished conflict, and positive relationships both within the management team and among superintendents and principals when pay discussions occurred. Once again, Tukey follow-up provided a discriminating lens for further

analysis. In every instance, superintendents who expressed high influence recorded mean scores that were significantly greater than their counterparts who expressed moderate or little influence over pay decisions for principals. Thus, school boards interested in maximizing the potential for interaction through greater dialogue in a non-threatening environment will satisfy their superintendents by providing meaningful opportunities accompanied by influence over final decisions.

Similarly, superintendents reported strong support for the principal's position when opportunties for influential participation existed. In Table 4, significant relationships were identified for board loyalty, role and procedural satisfaction, diminished conflict, and positive managerial interactions. Providing support for the principal's

---

Insert Table 4 about here

---

position could result in greater conflict. Yet, when these data are examined, it is clear that strong support was accompanied by higher levels of board loyalty and diminished conflict evidenced by positive managerial interaction. Tukey follow-up indicated that, in every case except board loyalty, significantly higher, more positive mean scores were recorded for high support juxtaposed to moderate levels of principal support. Therefore, superintendents who are actively involved in pay discusssions can express support

for the claim staked by principals without creating a major upheaval in the process.

CONFLICT AND ITS PROPER MANAGEMENT

Creating an influential and effective role for the superintendent necessarily involves recognition of the potential for conflict with board members, principals, or both groups. The proper management of conflict during pay discussions, then, is important if a positive outcome is desired.

Table 5 identified superintendent responses to several survey questions about the presence of conflict and conflict resolution behaviors employed by management team members. Data suggest that principal pay discussions

---

Insert Table 5 about here

---

through meet and discuss were not a major source of principal dissatisfaction or conflict within the management team. Additionally, superintendents viewed their role in discussions as supportive of management team philosophy.

Superintendents in this study indicated that most members of the management team engaged in conflict resolution behaviors geared toward channeling conflict in a positive direction. Success in such an endeavor is essential to the functioning of a management team approach in school governance. When conflict arose, the key resolu-

tion behaviors summarized by Tubbs (1978) were frequently employed. Although some writers have described the superintendency as a conflict-laden occupation, superintendent involvement in principal pay design may not be a major source of subordinate or superordinate conflict. Rational approaches to conflict management, as Nebgen (1977-78) noted, rely upon the use of such techniques as persuasion, compromise, and mutual problem-solving. Data in this study provide evidence that each technique can be applied successfully to the potentially-volatile climate of pay design.

CONCLUSION

Methods for determining principal salaries and benefits are as varied as the diversity in school district organization and operation across the nation. Traditionally, pay decisions for middle level managers resulted from unilateral determinations made by school boards who may have relied on superintendents to broker principal interests. With the growth of teacher unionism, administrator bargaining units emerged and, under such conditions, the superintendent's role, influence, and satisfaction with involvement took on a new character. Both approaches represent the extreme in principal pay design. But, as Kimbrough and Nunnery (1976) observed, middle ground alternatives developed including such variations as meet and discuss where the primary intent consisted of determining principal compensation while simultaneously strengthening management team structures.

In the present study, superintendent involvement in principal pay discussions occurred through the framework of a state-mandated meet and discuss model representing a change from traditional pay design methods. The findings suggest that change has not resulted in a diminished role or level of influence for the superintendent nor has it created a traumatic labor environment. Indeed, these data support three conclusions.

First, superintendents, principals, and school board members can interact formally on matters of principal self-interest without causing irreparable damage to management team structures. Most measures of managerial interaction as perceived by superintendents were positive when superintendents performed active roles in discussion accompanied by opportunties to influence decisions and support the principals' proposals. Active superintendent participation juxtaposed to observer status or disengagement from the process allowed school boards to tap the expertise or interpersonal skills of a key leader in the school organization. And, it would appear that such participation by the superintendent has not resulted in higher levels of conflict marked by strained, bureaucratic, or adversarial relationships as some have suggested when the level of formal board-administrator interaction increased (Karlitz, 1978).

Second, school boards interested in developing more harmonious managerial relationships can expect higher levels

of superintendent loyalty, satisfaction, and trust by actively engaging superintendents in principal pay discussions. Conventional wisdom suggests that disengagement from the process results in greater role ambiguity for the superintendent. Although role ambiguity was not addressed in this study, data indicated that higher levels of superintendent loyalty, satisfaction, and positive views toward the management team resulted from active, influential participation. In short, participation also serves a valued communicative function that transcends the substance of pay issues. Greater understanding and appreciation of the principals' accomplishments and difficulties can occur when superintendents engage in discussions centering around broader issues than salary schedules, insurance benefits, or paid vacation. Too, superintendent participation creates opportunities to demonstrate support and appreciation for the principal's job performance.

Third, although superintendents in the present study preferred direct discussions with principals, their active participation jointly with board members and principals was neither a source of conflict in the process nor a major irritant to superintendents. Herein rests a basic paradox that superintendents and board members ought to consider. Studies conducted among principals engaged in meet and discuss revealed higher levels of principal satisfaction and loyalty toward both superintendents and school boards when

formal sessions transpired between principals and school boards (Caldwell, 1984; Lebda, 1988). Yet, superintendents in this study noted a strong preference for singular interaction with principals. Indeed, the highest levels of superintendent loyalty and satisfaction were linked to this channel in the process.

These conclusions and the awareness developed from this exploratory study raise several questions requiring further reserach. Our understanding of superintendents' involvement in principal pay design will be enhanced when educational researchers, through a variety of methods ranging from ethnographic studies to more precise empirical research, conduct comparative studies among traditional, collective bargaining, and alternative approaches to compensating school principals.

In the present study, the superintendent's role, level of influence, and support for the principals' position were broadly defined. Greater delineation for each variable is needed. What constitutes support for principal proposals? Are there specific dimensions associated with such roles as board spokesperson or active in discussions? Have all the roles been defined? And, how does one identify and measure variations in influence? Finally, do each of these variables relate to other factors such as organizational commitment, role ambiguity, and leadership styles?

A second area for additional research relates to the substance of superintendent involvement in principal pay

design. The present study revealed little about the values and expectations of superintendents. How do superintendents promote their values particularly those in conflict with the expectations of principals or school boards? Do superintendent values constrain, bolster, or moderate principals' proposals and willingness to enter into frank discussions? When the superintendent's expectations go unfulfilled, how do they respond? Or, do superintendent expectations change as board members and principals reveal their preferences?

Finally, the linkage between superintendent involvement in principal pay design and the web of controls over administrative behavior as detailed by Murphy, Hallinger, Peterson, and Lotto (1987) require investigation. When conflict arises in pay discussions, what specifc behaviors and mechanisms are used by the superintendent? And, are they similar to those employed during the normal course of operating the school district? Do relationships exist between superintendent-principal interaction in pay discussions and subsequent managerial interaction? How does superintendent involvement affect the chief administrative officer's overall leadership behavior?

In conclusion, superintendent involvement in principal pay design can result in the development of an effective compensation system while simultaneously strengthening management team structures. It would appear from this study that the key rests with the active, influential participa-

tion of superintendents who appreciate and express support for school principals as salary and benefit determinations emerge.

Table 1

Correlations Among Demographic, Procedural, and Attitudinal Variables (N=177)

Variable	Board Loyalty	Team Relations	Con-flict	Role Sat.	Sup/Prin Relations
Demographic Variables					
Aid Ratio	-.02	.08	-.01	-.02	.03
Dist. Enroll.	.02	-.07	-.07	.01	-.03
Gender	-.05	-.17 *	.01	-.03	-.19 *
Present Age	.02	.10	.10	.03	.10
Years Admin.	.02	.14	.13	.04	.17 *
Years Pos.	.00	.20 **	.22 *	-.04	.19 *
No. Principals	-.07	-.13	-.13	.05	-.11
Procedural Variables					
Process	.20	.15	.19 *	.19 *	.23 **
Posture	-.33 **	-.26 **	-.34 **	-.46 **	-.34 **
Role	-.22 **	-.11	-.19 *	-.23 **	-.10
Influence	-.35 **	-.20 **	-.25 **	-.48 **	-.18 *
Support	.19 **	-.32 **	-.32 **	-.20 **	-.26 **
Attitudinal Variables					
Board Loyal.	1.00	.46 **	.39 **	.46 **	.41 **
Team Rel.		1.00	.79 **	.46 **	.72 **
Conflict			1.00	.53 **	.84 **
Role Satis.				1.00	.49 **
Supt/Prin Rel.					1.00

* Significant beyond the .05 confidence level
** Significant beyond the .01 confidence level

Table 2

Summary of Selected Analysis of Variance Results: Superintendent Influence, Support for Principals, Board Loyalty, and Perceptions of Managerial Interaction By Role

Variable	Mean Score	df	F-Ratio	P
Influence	1.6467	166	20.5358	.0001 **
Support	1.3434	165	5.2260	.0018 **
Board Loyalty	16.4939	163	3.6690	.0136 *
Management Team Relations	17.0732	163	3.3387	.0209 *
Conflict	16.4321	161	3.5214	.0165 *
Superintendent/ Principal Interaction	16.3230	166	1.9441	.1247

* Significant beyond the .05 confidence level
** Significant beyond the .01 confidence level

Table 3

Summary of Selected Analysis of Variance Results: Superintendent Loyalty, Satisfaction, and Perceptions of Managerial Interaction By Influence

Variable	Mean Score	df	F-Ratio	P
Board Loyalty	16.5655	167	10.8261	.0001 **
Role Satis.	4.0947	168	20.1506	.0001 **
Procedural Satis.	4.0291	171	9.7041	.0001 **
Management Team Relations	17.1183	168	4.1318	.0074 *
Conflict	16.4671	166	8.5495	.0001 **
Superintendent/ Principal Interaction	16.3855	165	7.2067	.0001 **

* Significant beyond the .05 confidence level
** Significant beyond the .01 confidence level

Table 4

Summary of Selected Analysis of Variance Results: Superintendent Loyalty, Satisfaction, and Perceptions of Managerial Interaction by Support for Principals

Variable	Mean Score	df	F-Ratio	P
Board Loyalty	16.5298	167	3.3275	.0383 *
Role Satis.	4.0952	167	5.4224	.0052 **
Procedural Satis.	4.0291	171	3.4647	.0335 *
Management Team Relations	17.1361	168	13.2693	.0001 **
Conflict	16.4970	166	15.6138	.0001 **
Superintendent/ Principal Interaction	16.4096	165	11.2674	.0001 **

* Significant beyond the .05 confidence level
** Significant beyond the .01 confidence level

Table 5

Measures of Conflict and Conflict Resolution Behavior (N=177)

Attitudinal Measures	**	Percent of Responses * SA	A	U	D	SD
1. Meet and discuss interactions increased the level of principal dissatisfaction in our district.		2	12	14	40	32
2. In our district, the superintendent's role supported a management team philosophy.		52	43	3	1	1
3. Act 93 procedures increased the level of conflict between middle-level and top management.		1	7	10	43	39
4. My current role in principal pay design contributes to greater conflict between the superintendent and building principals.		2	9	9	44	34
5. When conflict arises within our management team, most team members:						
a). focus on the problem, not on personalities		28	55	4	10	3
b). attempt to build on areas of agreement		26	67	4	2	1
c). work to achieve consensus		27	67	3	2	1
d). avoid provoking further conflict		21	65	9	4	1
e). do not overreact to other's comments		17	60	13	9	1
f). consider compromise		20	74	4	1	1

* Percents may not equal 100 due to rounding.

** SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, U = Uncertain, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree

REFERENCES

Arnez, N. (1981). The besieged school superintendent: A case study of school superintendent-school board relations in Washington, D.C., 1973-75. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, Inc.

Blumberg, A., & Blumberg, P. (1985). The school superintendent: Living with conflict. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bolton, D.L. (1980). Evaluating administrative personnel in school systems. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Boyd, W.L. (1976). The public, the professionals, and educational policy making. Who governs? Teachers College Record, 77(4), 539-577.

Bridges, E.M. (1982). Research on the school administrator: The state of the art, 1967-1980. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(3), 12-33.

Burlingame, M. (1981). Superintendent power retention. In S. B. Bacharach (Ed.), Organizational behavior in schools and school districts (pp. 429-464). New York: New York: Praeger.

Burton, G.A. (1977). Administrative bargaining units: A study of the attitudes of superintendents, secondary and elementary principals in selected Michigan school districts (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 5811-A.

Caldwell, W.E. (1986). Equity in principal salaries: A model. NASSP Bulletin, 70, 67-71.

Caldwell, W.E. (1988). Fifth annual survey-PAESP 1987-88 salary survey. Principal Profile, Special Edition, 1-6.

Caldwell, W.E., & Paul, D.M. (1984, April). Principals' input on self-interest issues influence perceptions of organizational climate. Paper presentation: American Educational Research Association.

Castetter, W.B. (1986). The personnel function in educational administration (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Cooper, B.S. (1979). Collective bargaining for school administrators four years later. Phi Delta Kappan, 61 (2), 130-131.

Cooper, B.S., & Murrmann, K.F. (1982). Managerial identification and the unionization of school administrators. Administrator's Notebook, 30(1), 1-4.

Crowson, R.L. (1987). The local school district superintendency: A puzzling role. Educational Administration Quarterly, 23(3), 49-69.

Crowson, R.L., & Morris, V.C. (1987). The superintendency and school law: An exploratory study. Paper presentation: American Educational Research Association.

Cuban, L. (1984). Transforming the frog into a prince: Effective schools research, policy, and practice at the district level. Harvard Educational Review, 54(2), 129-151.

Cuban, L. (1985). Conflict and leadership in the superintendency. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(1), 28-30.

Cunningham, L.L., & Hentges, J.T. (1982). The American school superintendency 1982: A summary report. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

DeYoung, A.J. (1986). Excellence in education: The opportunity for school superintendents to become ambitious? Educational Administration Quarterly, 22(2), 91-113.

Deutsch, M. (1973). The resolution of conflict. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Duignan, P. (1980). Administrative behavior of school superintendents: A descriptive study. The Journal of Educational Administration, 18(1), 5-26.

Educational Research Service (1985). School superintendents: Opinions and status. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Educational Research Service (1987). Methods of scheduling salaries for principals (3rd ed.). Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Gross, N., Mason, W.S., & McEachern, A.W. (1958). Explorations in role analysis: Studies of the school superintendency role. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Hannaway, J., & Sproull, L.S. (1978-19). Who's running the show? Coordination and control in educational organizations. Administrator's Notebook, 27(9), 1-5.

Hart, A.W., & Ogawa, R.T. (1987). The influence of superintendents on the academic achievement of school districts. The Journal of Educational Administration, 25(1), 72-84.

Kasten, K.L., & Ashbaugh, C.R. (1987). The place of values in superintendents' work. Paper presentation: American Educational Research Association.

Knezevich, S.J. (ed). (1971). The American school superintendent. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators.

Karlitz, H. (1978). Educational administrators and teacher unions: An alliance of convenience. The Clearinghouse, 52, 125-128.

Keough, K.E., & Seaton, G. (1988). Superintendents' views on AIDS: A national survey. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(5), 358-361.

Kimbrough, R.B., & Nunnery, M.Y. (1976). Educational Administration: An introduction. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Lebda, J.J. (1987). When principals want to talk money, it just might pay your board to listen. The American School Board Journal, 174(4), 36-37.

Lebda, J.J. (1988). Administrative compensation: A study of principal input through the framework of a state-mandated model. Paper presentation: American Educational Research Association.

McCarty, D.J., & Ramsey, C.E. (1971). The school managers. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Publishing Company.

March, J.G. (1978). American public school administration: A short analysis. School Review, 86(2), 217-250.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., Peterson, K.D., & Lotto, L.S. (1987). The administrative control of principals in effective school districts. The Journal of Educational Administration, 25(2), 161-186.

Nebgen, M.K. (1977-78). Conflict management in schools. Administrator's Notebook, 26(6), 1-4.

Paulu, N. (1989). Key player in school reform: The superintendent. The School Administrator, 46(3), 8-14.

Pellicer, L.O., Anderson, L.W., Keefe, J.W., Kelley, E.A., & McCleary, L.E. (1988). High school leaders and their schools: Vol. 1: A national profile. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Peterson, K. D., Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1987). Superintendents' perceptions of the control and coordination of the technical core in effective school districts. Educational Administration Quarterly, 23(1), 79-95.

Pitner, N.J., & Ogawa, R.T. (1981). Organizational leadership: The case of the school superintendent. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(2), 45-65.

Pounder, D. (1985). Administrative compensation: A preliminary investigation of the male/female salary differential. Paper presentation: University Council of Educational Administrators.

Rebore, R.W. (1985). Educational administration: A management approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Salmon, P.B. (1972). Are the administrative team and collective bargaining compatible? Compact, 6, 3-5.

Schein, E.H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Tracy, S.J., Sheehan, R. (1987, April). Administrative compensation: An investigation of factors accounting for salary differentials. Paper presentation: American Educational Research Association.

Tubbs, S.L. (1978). A systems approach to small group interaction. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Williams, R.M., Jr. (1979). Change and stability in values and value systems: A sociological perspective. In M. Rokeach (Ed.). Understanding human values: Individual and societal (pp. 15-46). New York: Free Press.

Willower, D.J., & Fraser, H.W. (1979-80). School superintendents on their work. Administrator's Notebook, 29(5), 1-4.

Zeigler, I.H., & Jennings, M.K. (1974). Governing American Schools. North Scituate, Mass: Duxbury Press.